

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 have been canceled, without prejudice, and new claims 7-13 have been added. Claims 7-13 are presently pending.

The specification has been amended to add section headings and to correct typographical and grammatical errors uncovered during further review of the application. Accordingly, the Examiner's objection to the specification has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

New claims 7-13, which replace claims 1-6, clarify what is the claimed invention and have been written to conform with claiming formalities.

In view of such amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims, as presently presented, are respectfully requested.

EXAMINER'S ACTION

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,841,373 ("Mason") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,671 ("Comerford *et al.*"). In addition, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mason in view of Comerford *et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,389 ("Imaizumi *et al.*"). Further, claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mason in view of Comerford *et al.*, and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art ("APA").

New claims 7-13 replace previously pending claims 1-6, which have been canceled. New independent method claim 7, claims 8-12 which depend directly or indirectly upon claim 7, and new independent apparatus claim 13 clearly are patentable

over each of the cited references alone, or in any combination thereof.

Claim 7, as amended, is directed to a method for inputting text using a cursor, where the cursor is used to select a character from a character set for input as text, and where the characters are "weighted according to frequency statistics of character sequences". In addition, claim 7 requires that the selecting of the characters by the cursor "includes advancing the cursor across at least one first character to at least one adjacent, second character". (See specification, for example, at page 6, lines 7-9; page 9, lines 12-18; and FIG. 3). Further, claim 7 recites that "the weighting on the first character defines a distance that the cursor moves when the cursor advances across the first character". (See specification, for example, at page 8, lines 1-18; page 9, lines 1-12; and FIG. 3). Advantageously, according to the claimed invention, as a user moves the cursor across consecutively adjacent characters, the cursor travels a shorter distance, and therefore can move faster, over narrowed characters, which have been determined to be less probable for input as text (the characters being narrowed in accordance with the weighting), such that the cursor more rapidly advances to a character which has been determined to be more probable for input as text. (See specification, for example, at page 8, lines 1-12; page 9, lines 19-27; page 13, lines 17-18; and FIG. 3).

The Examiner admitted that Mason does not disclose weighting of characters of a character set, as required by claim 7. Furthermore, Mason does not teach or suggest weighting characters of the character set, where the weighting is based on the probability that a character is a next most probable character for input as text and "defines a distance that the cursor moves when the cursor advances across" the

character, also as required by claim 7.

Comerford *et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of Mason with respect to the requirements of claim 7. Although Comerford *et al.* describes emphasizing characters which are more probable for input as text, Comerford *et al.* concerns the use of a pointing device, such as a mouse, in combination with a display, where the pointing device is used to move a cursor directly to a character located anywhere on the display. Such direct positioning of a cursor to any location on the display with a pointing device is very different than the controlled advancement of the cursor, from a first character to an adjacent, second character, for selecting a character for input as text, as required by the claimed invention. In addition, nowhere does Comerford *et al.* teach or suggest defining the "distance" that the cursor moves across a character, in accordance with the weighting of the characters as required by claim 7, such that, as the cursor advances from character to adjacent character, the cursor can be moved more quickly over the narrowed (shorter distance) characters, which are less probable for input as text, and thus more rapidly advance to a character which is more probable for input as text.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Comerford *et al.* with Mason, because Comerford *et al.* concerns directly positioning a cursor in the absence of controlled cursor advancement from character to adjacent character, as required by Mason and also the claimed invention. Further, even if Mason and Comerford *et al.* were combined, despite the lack of any teaching, suggestion or motivation for such combination in either of the references, the resulting combination would not provide for "advancing the cursor" across a first character to a second, adjacent character as part of selecting a character

for input as text, as required by claim 7, where the characters are weighted to define a distance that the cursor moves across a character, such that the cursor can be moved more rapidly over characters which are less probable for input as text and, thus, can more rapidly be advanced to a character which is more probable for input as text.

Accordingly, claim 7 is patentable over the combination of Mason and Comerford *et al.*

In addition, new independent claim 13, which claims an apparatus for inputting text using a cursor having restrictions corresponding to those set forth in claim 7, also is patentable over the combination of Mason and Comerford *et al.* for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 7.

Further, claims 8-12, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 7, are also patentable over the combination of Mason and Comerford *et al.* alone, or further in view of Imaizumi *et al.* or the APA, for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 7 and because of the further restrictions they add.

As to claim 9, although Imaizumi *et al.* describes moving a cursor within a window existing on a display for controlling the size and position of the window on the display, there is no teaching or suggestion of controlling movement of a cursor across adjacent characters by moving an indicator (*i.e.*, an embedded cursor) within the cursor, as required by claim 9.

Withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims, as presently presented, are patentable.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if it is believed that further amendment and/or discussion would help to advance the prosecution of the present application.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 7-13 are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Davy E. Zonerach
Registration Number 37,267

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS
P.O. Box 1018
Somerville, New Jersey 08876-1018
Phone: (908) 722-0700
Fax: (908) 722-0755
E-Mail: ipdept@nmmlaw.com

Attorney Docket No: 101185-15US